REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 1, 7, 12, and 20 have been amended, claims 9, 14, and 22 have been canceled without prejudice, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-21, and 22-27 now are pending.

In the Office Action mailed 08/12/2004, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 2 as being indefinite for containing a limitation for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. The examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-13, 15, 17-21, 23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Padovani</u> (US Patent No. 6,151,502). The Examiner stated that the remaining claims 8, 16, and 24 and 9, 14, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten as indicated. Additionally, the examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 under nonstatutory double patenting over a prior patent.

Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

I. 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 2: Claims 7 and 9

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 2 as being indefinite for containing a limitation for which there is insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 6 to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitations of claim 7. Claim 9 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejection to the claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102(e): Claims 1-7, 10-13, 15, 17-21, 23 and 25-27

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-13, 15, 17-21, 23 and 25-2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Padovani</u> (US Patent No. 6,151,502). Claims 1, 12 and 20 are the independent claims. The Examiner stated that claims 9, 14, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten as indicated.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 9. Independent claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 14. Independent claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 22. Claims 9, 14, and 22 have been canceled without prejudice.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejection to the claims.

Attorney Docket No.: PA661C1

Customer No.: 23696

III. Allowable Claims 8, 16, and 24 and 9, 14, and 22

The Examiner stated that the claims 8, 16, and 24 and 9, 14, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten as indicated.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 9.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 14.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 22.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

IV. 35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 14 and 15

The examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 under nonstatutory double patenting over a prior patent.

Included with this response is a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection over a prior patent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejection to the claims.

Attorney Docket No.: PA661C1

Customer No.: 23696

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/17/2004

QUALCOMM Incorporated 5775 Morehouse Drive San Diego, California 92121 Telephone: (858) 651-4125

Facsimile:

(858) 658-2502

Attorney Docket No.: PA661C1

Customer No.: 23696